

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/081,357	57 02/22/2002		Douglas H. Wylie	D1841-00079 9759		
8933	7590	05/25/2005		EXAMINER		
	DUANE MORRIS, LLP IP DEPARTMENT			FISCHER, JUSTIN R		
ONE LIBERTY PLACE				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-7396			1733			

DATE MAILED: 05/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/081,357	WYLIE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Justin R. Fischer	1733	

= or or o the raining or arresposit = rec	Examiner	Artonit					
	Justin R. Fischer	1733					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 03 May 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of							
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follor places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:	otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	compliance with 37 (CFR 41.31; or				
 a) Yes period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. 							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or 		educing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))		jected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	•	, timely filed amendm	ent canceling				
7. A For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-8</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>10-13</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>9</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>14-50</u> . <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appery and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	ched.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application/Control Number: 10/081,357

Art Unit: 1733

Continuation of 11: As set forth in the Final Rejection, the claims as currently drafted do not require the insertion member be a blade as depicted in Figure 32 of the claimed nor do they require the insertion member have a continuous contacting surface with the screen/frame assembly. It is further noted that the description of an elongated structure as "straight" is not seen to exclude the presence of components that are not "straight"in particular, the term "straight" is used to describe the structure as a whole and thus refers to the arrangement/orientation of the boundaries that define the elongated structure. Thus, the plurality of rollers in Insalaco, which are mounted on a bracket, are seen to constitute a "straight" insertion member in that the boundary of the insertion member is defined by a single plane. While applicant contends that Insalaco's set of rollers is no more straight than a comb, it is the examiner's position that a comb can equally be viewed as a "straight" object. In order to overcome the rejection of record, it is suggested that the insertion member be described as a blade or as a member having a continuous contacting surface with the screen/frame assembly.

May 18, 2005

Page 2